arXiv:1409.7831v1 [physics.soc-ph] 27 Sep 2014

Building Damage-Resilient Dominating Sets in Complex Networks against Random and Targeted Attacks

F. Molnár Jr.[1,2,*], N. Derzsy[1,2], B. K. Szymanski[2,3], G. Korniss[1,2]

September 30, 2014

[1] Department of Physics, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 110 8^{th} Street, Troy, NY, 12180-3590 USA
[2] Social Cognitive Networks Academic Research Center, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 110 8^{th} Street, Troy, NY, 12180-3590 USA
[3] Department of Computer Science, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 110 8^{th} Street, Troy, NY, 12180-3590 USA

Abstract

We study the vulnerability of dominating sets against random and targeted node removals in complex networks. While small, cost-efficient dominating sets play a significant role in controllability and observability of these networks, a fixed and intact network structure is always implicitly assumed. We find that cost-efficiency of dominating sets optimized for small size alone comes at a price of being vulnerable to damage; domination in the remaining network can be severely disrupted, even if a small fraction of dominator nodes are lost. We develop two new methods for finding flexible dominating sets, allowing either adjustable overall resilience, or dominating set size, while maximizing the dominated fraction of the remaining network after the attack. We analyze the efficiency of each method on synthetic scale-free networks, as well as real complex networks.

Introduction

Dominating sets play a critical role in complex networked systems by providing efficient sources of influence and information dispersal, or hubs of surveillance [1, 2, 3, 4], and are applied in social, infrastructure, and communication networks [5, 6, 7]. Most recently,

*E-mail: molnaf@rpi.edu

dominating sets were employed to controllability in complex networks [8, 9, 10, 11], observability of the power-grid [12], and to finding high-impact optimal subsets in protein interaction networks [13]. While finding the smallest, most efficient dominating set has gained significant interest, it is also important to understand how robust these dominating sets are against various forms of network damage.

By definition, a dominating set is a subset of nodes in a network, such that every node not in the dominating set is adjacent to at least one node in this set; in other words, every node has at least one neighbor (or itself) in the dominating set. The smallest cardinality dominating set is the minimum dominating set (MDS), which is of particular interest, because it provides the most cost-efficient solution for network control, assuming a constant per-node cost of implementing control, in fixed or slowly evolving networks. Research has been focused on finding bounds for the size of MDS [1, 14], finding approximations to the MDS [15, 16], understanding its expected scaling behavior in complex networks [3, 4], and studying the impact of assortativity on network domination [2, 17].

Attacks on complex networks, fault tolerance, and defense strategies against damage of nodes and edges have also gained significant interest in network science [18, 19, 20, 21]. Networks with scale-free topologies have been found to be resilient against random node damage, but vulnerable to targeted removal of high degree nodes [22, 23, 24]. Research has also focused on improving the robustness of these networks against various combinations of attacks [25, 26, 27], and on studying the dynamically progressing effects of an initial damage, such as cascading failures [28, 29].

The connectivity of the surviving network structures and the fraction of the remaining set of nodes still dominated following failures or attacks are both essential for sustainable network operations and carrying out network functions. While the former (structural integrity) has been studied in great detail over the past two decades [18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24], the latter (domination stability) has not received any attention.

We assume that the network damage is relatively small, and although the network may become fragmented due to the loss of nodes, we assume it remains functional. In such cases efficient domination over the network is still important and desirable, just as it is in undamaged networks. However, considering that most dominating set search methods aim for the smallest possible set size (and corresponding cost) in a fixed topology network, even a small damage could severely disrupt the complete domination "coverage". Our goal is to understand how fragile dominating sets are, how to improve them, and ultimately to provide new methods for selecting dominating sets with adjustable balance between resilience and cost.

In order to quantify the resilience of a dominating set against network damage, we define *domination stability* as the fraction of the remaining network still dominated after some nodes have been removed from the network (and thus from the dominating set):

$$s(f) := \frac{|\bigcup_{j\in \mathrm{DS}} \mathrm{N}^+(j)|}{N(1-f)}, \tag{1}$$

where DS is a dominating set of the original (undamaged) network, f is the fraction of nodes removed from the network, and $\mathrm{N}^+(j)$ is the closed neighborhood of node j that still exists in the remaining network. In order to measure stability, we need to simulate network damage by actually removing nodes from the network and calculating the remaining dominated fraction.

Domination stability depends not only on the fraction of removed nodes, but also on the order in which nodes have been removed from the network. Similarly to many studies in the literature, we consider two damage scenarios: random and targeted node removals. The random node removal strategy models network damage produced by natural causes or errors, while the targeted node removal method reflects the impact of intentional, targeted attacks on a network. In the random damage scenario nodes are removed with equal probability, in random order. In case of targeted attacks, the nodes are removed in degree-ranked order, with highest degrees being removed first. We indicate which strategy we consider in the subscript of stability: s_{rand} denotes the stability against random damage, and s_{deg} corresponds to the stability against degree-ranked removal.

Results

Stability of Various Fixed Dominating Sets

We start our analysis by measuring the stability of three different dominating sets, that we use for baseline comparison with our new methods. These are the following:

- greedy minimum dominating set (MDS) [1, 4, 30], where nodes are selected by a sequential greedy search algorithm in order to approximate the actual (NP-hard) smallest dominating set,
- "cutoff" dominating set (CDS) [17], where all nodes above a degree threshold are selected into set X, and the nodes not dominated by any nodes in set X are selected into set Y. The dominating set is then given by $X \cup Y$. The degree threshold is selected such that it minimizes the size of the resulting dominating set,
- degree-ranked dominating set (DDS), where we select all nodes in decreasing order of degree (with random tie-breaking) as dominators until the selected set dominates the entire network.

Our first choice is MDS, due to its importance in cost-efficient control of complex networks, and because it provides a high-quality approximation to the actual smallest dominating set. The other methods we have chosen are potentially useful when finding the greedy MDS or solving the binary integer programming equivalent is impractical, e.g., when the adjacency information of the network is incomplete, or the network is too large to run these algorithms in a reasonable amount of time. In these cases heuristic algorithms, such as

CDS or DDS can find suboptimal (not the smallest possible), yet small enough dominating sets that are still useful for practical applications. In particular, the excess nodes selected by these methods may help to increase domination stability.

Figure 1 shows the stability against the fraction of removed nodes for MDS, CDS and DDS in the entire remaining network [Fig. 1(a), (b)] and in the remaining giant component [Fig. 1(c), (d)]. It is clear that the degree-ranked node removal reduces the dominated fraction much faster than the random node removal, because high-degree nodes are more likely to be dominator nodes than low degree nodes. The giant component itself also breaks down much faster, as shown in the insets of Fig. 1(c) and (d). However, as long as a giant component exists, it has higher domination stability than the entire network, in both scenarios. The slight increase of stability at high damage rates is a side effect caused by removal of nodes that had lost domination by earlier removals. When the network damage is high, it becomes more likely that these nodes are deleted, causing the dominated fraction of the remaining network to increase. At this point, however, the network is almost completely destroyed and domination stability becomes meaningless.

The stability curves show much more disturbed shapes in degree-ranked removal than random removal, due to the differences in the degree structure of each dominating set. In MDS, there is no preference toward any particular node degree during selection of dominators (besides the natural effect of the greedy selection, where the high-degree nodes provide a larger increase in the number of dominated nodes, hence they are more likely to be selected), which means that removal of high-degree nodes has a smooth (albeit strong) impact on stability. In CDS, we can see a fast initial drop as we remove the very high degree nodes that were specifically selected for dominators (in set X), then continuing at a more gentle slope as the dominators from the Y set are removed, since any node that was not dominated by X, regardless of degree, may be in set Y. On one hand the Y set may seem wasteful in its construction, but with the right degree threshold the size of the CDS is actually very close to the MDS [17], and the excess nodes provide a fair increase in stability. DDS is the simplest but most inefficient method for finding a dominating set because it selects *all* nodes starting from the highest degrees until all nodes are dominated. However, the resulting redundancy of dominators in the network is providing the highest stability of all three methods.

We can also observe the general tendency that a larger dominating set provides higher stability. At any given fraction of removed nodes, there is a positive correlation between stability and the size of the original dominating set, in both random [Fig. 1(a)] and degree-ranked [Fig. 1(b)] node removals. We clearly illustrate this correlation in Fig. 1(e) and (f), where we show stability as a function of the dominating set size, at various damage levels. This means that the MDS, which is the smallest (most cost-efficient) dominating set, is also the most vulnerable, to both random damage and targeted attacks.

Note, that Fig. 1 only shows the stability for a certain network type with given degree exponent and uncorrelated networks (where Spearman's $\rho = 0$). Stabilities at different values of these parameters are presented in Supplementary Figures S1–S5.

We have also included supplementary videos to illustrate the evolution of domination stability as the network disintegrates, during random node removal (Supplementary Movie 1) and degree-ranked node removal (Supplementary Movie 2).

The main conclusion we can draw is that the extra amount of dominating nodes selected by heuristic methods CDS and DDS, compared to the smaller and more optimal MDS, can effectively increase the stability of domination. However, all three methods are "fixed" in the sense that they give only a single possible dominating set size (and corresponding stability) for a given network.

Flexible-Redundancy Dominating Set (frDS)

In order to overcome the limitations of fixed methods, we must analyze in detail how domination is lost when the network is damaged. First, we realize that loss of domination occurs locally at each node: those nodes that lose all dominators will reduce the domination stability of the network. Therefore, stability can be expressed locally, as the domination *redundancy* of each node. This quantity simply counts how many dominating nodes are within the closed neighborhood of a given node. A large dominating set can successfully increase domination stability, if the extra nodes are distributed in a way that they increase domination redundancy on many nodes. This seems to occur naturally for CDS and DDS, however we cannot guarantee that redundancy was increased in the most optimal way (relative to MDS), nor can we control the number of selected nodes.

We introduce the flexible-redundancy dominating set (frDS) to solve these problems. We explicitly set an average domination redundancy in the network, denoted by r, that must be guaranteed by frDS, while aiming for minimum set size. Note, that $r = 1$ is equivalent to the minimum dominating set (MDS), and when r is an integer, the frDS is identical to the *h-dominating set* (with $h = r$) studied by Cooper, et al. [40]. Finding an frDS is most likely NP-hard, since it is also NP-hard to find an MDS [41] or an h-dominating set [42], but we can use a modified greedy algorithm to find an approximation.

The steps of finding an frDS are as follows. First, we assign a domination redundancy requirement, $r(i)$ for each node i as an integer value indicating at least how many dominators node i must have in the dominating set. Given the desired average (non-integer) r value for the entire network, we assign the nearest integer values $\lfloor r \rfloor$ and $\lceil r \rceil$ to each node randomly, such that the network average will be r (the probability of assigning $\lceil r \rceil$ is $r - \lfloor r \rfloor$, which is analogous to a biased coin toss). For the greedy selection we define a dominating potential $p(i)$ as the number of nodes in the closed neighborhood of i that have not yet reached their domination requirement, and therefore selecting node i can help them advance toward their goal. (Note, by definition, the potential of an already selected node is zero.) At each greedy step we select one node with maximum dominating potential (with random tie-breaking), until the requirements of all nodes have been fulfilled. Note, that since dominating potential is an integer number between 0 and N, nodes can be sorted according to their potential in $O(N)$ steps, and it is possible to maintain sort-

edness after changing the potential of a node in $O(1)$ step (see Supplementary Note 1 for further details and pseudocode). This results in the same computational time complexity as for the greedy MDS approximation, $O(E)$. Also note, that if $r > N$, then the node requirements can never be satisfied, in which case the greedy selection naturally falls back to selecting nodes in degree-ranked order, because at every step every neighbor of a node may be advanced toward its goal.

Flexible-Cost Dominating Set (fcDS)

When we aim for a desired dominating set size (cost level, i.e., having a limited budget), we can, in principle, aim for the necessary redundancy level in frDS to achieve that desired cost. However, we can further improve stability by considering the expected attack pattern on the network (if the information is available), and optimize the selected dominating set accordingly. For example, if the attack is expected at high-degree nodes, we should avoid selecting many of those nodes as dominators, despite their ability to cover large fractions of the network.

We can optimize our choice of dominators by including the probability of losing each node into the calculation of local stability, which we aim to maximize. First, we assign a strength value $s(i) \in (0, 1)$ to each node i, which represents the a-priori estimated probability for not losing that node after the attack (i.e., the anticipated attack pattern). Then, we calculate the current domination stability of node i as follows:

$$\text{stability}(\text{DS}, i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \text{DS} \cap N^+(i) = \varnothing \\ 1 - \prod_{j \in \text{DS} \cap N^+(i)} (1 - s(j)) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

which is the probability that node i will remain dominated (not lose all dominators), assuming nodes will be deleted independently; DS denotes the currently selected dominating set. For selecting the next dominator, we choose one that increases the total stability of the network maximally. The total potential increase of stability can be calculated for each node as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{potential}(i) &= \sum_{j \in N^+(i)} \text{stability}(\text{DS} \cup \{\text{i}\}, j) - \text{stability}(\text{DS}, j) && (3) \\ &= \sum_{j \in N^+(i)} (1 - \text{stability}(\text{DS}, i)) \cdot s(i). && (4) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we always select a node with maximum potential (with random tie-breaking). Note, that unlike in frDS, the potential here is a non-integer value, thus we can only use comparative sorting to order nodes by potential, which needs $O(N \log N)$ steps. In addition, after selecting each dominator, the stability values have to be recomputed in the selected node's closed neighborhood, and the potentials up to the node's second neighborhood. This involves $O(d^2)$ nodes, where d is the average degree. Thus, maintaining

sortedness of nodes by their potential requires $O(d^2 \log N)$ steps after selecting each dominator.

In order to compare stability of fcDS with frDS and other dominating sets, we calculate the "a-priori" node strength values as follows: $s(i) = 0.5$ for random node removal, and $s(i) = 1 - d(i)/N$ for degree-ranked node removal. Here, we assume the size of the anticipated damage is unknown, thus strength values are expressing relative probabilities only. The strength value for a random damage is arbitrary, as long as it is uniform among the nodes, and it is inversely proportional to node degree in a degree-ranked attack. Further details of fcDS and pseudocode are included in Supplementary Note 2.

Stability Comparison of Dominating Sets

We seek to answer two main questions in our analysis. First, we want to see how much stability we can achieve by selecting various sizes of dominating sets (in other words, how does the stability scale with larger invested cost of domination). Second, we want to know how much more efficient our methods are compared to the fixed dominating sets, that is, given the same size of dominating set as MDS, CDS, or DDS, how much higher stability can our methods provide.

Figures 2 and 3 show domination stability achieved by frDS and fcDS as a function of redundancy and dominating set size, respectively. Stability achieved by the fixed methods (MDS, CDS, DDS) are also shown at their corresponding cost values for comparison. The general shape of the curves in both figures are similar, since the dominating set size is roughly proportional to redundancy (see Fig. 2 inset and Supplementary Fig. S6). In case of random damage, the stability rapidly increases with cost, until the size of MDS is reached, then the curve saturates. There is little advantage in selecting a dominating set larger than approximately twice the size of MDS, because stability is already very close to 1, even at large damage values. However, in case of degree-ranked damage, there is a steady increase in stability as more nodes are selected as dominators. In both cases, fcDS provides somewhat higher stability than frDS at moderate damage levels, but frDS is more stable at small damage levels. These observations hold across a wide range of network parameters, see Supplementary Figs. S7 and S8. It is also clear that both frDS and fcDS can provide great flexibility in adjusting the size of the dominating set and stability.

The stability of frDS and fcDS at cost levels identical to MDS, CDS, and DDS are presented in Fig. 4. Our results show that frDS provides stability values very similar to the fixed methods (in case of MDS, it is identical by definition, thus it is not shown), while fcDS shows a minor improvement in stability. On the other hand, both frDS and fcDS show significant improvement over the fixed methods against degree-ranked attacks, at low network damage fractions. MDS and CDS show a tipping point in damage, where these methods become slightly more effective than frDS or fcDS, but the difference is minimal, and it occurs only at moderate to high network damage ($f \gtrsim 0.3$).

Stability in Real Networks

We analyze stability of frDS and fcDS, as well as other dominating sets, in several real complex networks, listed in Table 1. These include an internet peer-to-peer network (p2p-Gnutella08) [43], the power transmission network of continental Europe (ENTSO-E powergrid) [44, 45], and one brain graph extracted from MRI data (KKI21-KKI2009-19) [46, 47]. Note, that we only use the giant component of these networks. A brief analysis of the degree distribution of Gnutella08 is provided in Supplementary Figs. S15–S17; degree distribution of the powergrid is provided in Supplementary Figs. S18–S21.

The brain graph we analyze here (KKI-21-KKI2009-19) is one of 200 graphs available from [46]. These graphs have peculiar structural properties, and are very similar to each other. In particular, all brain graphs are very dense: $\langle k \rangle \approx 150$ (Supplementary Fig. S21); they are all very assortative: $\rho \approx 0.6$ (Supplementary Fig. S22); and they have very similar degree distributions (see Supplementary Figs. S23–S25). It is also interesting that the size of MDS is very small, only 3-4% network size, while the size of CDS and DDS is very large, around 60% and 100% of network size, respectively (Supplementary Fig. S26). We attempt to separate the effects of density and assortativity in order to identify their impact on domination stability.

Figure 5 shows domination stability as a function of dominating set size for the real network samples. In general, we see that stability of frDS and fcDS matches the stability of MDS, and exceeds the stability of CDS and DDS, at identical set sizes. In case of Gnutella08 and the powergrid, the stability curves saturate slowly, and the curve shapes are not as smooth as for synthetic scale-free networks, due to having more disturbed (non-scale-free) degree distributions. However, the brain graph shows very high domination stability against both random and targeted attacks. In all cases, the relative advantage of frDS and fcDS over CDS and DDS (i.e., cost-efficiency) remains as high as in synthetic scale-free networks.

We can observe the effects of assortativity separately from other structural properties by artificially changing the network's assortativity, using a biased edge-mixing method (see in [17] and Supplementary Note 3), which rewires the edges in the graph, while keeping the degree sequence unchanged. Using this method we present a brief analysis of dominating set size vs. assortativity in Supplementary Figs. S27–S29. In general, we see the expected behavior that dominating sets tend to become larger in more assortative networks [17]. Note, that the size of DDS in the brain graph (Supplementary Fig. S29) being 100% of nodes regardless of assortativity is the result of a particular topological feature; there are a small number of leaves (degree 1 nodes) connected to degree 2 nodes, thus DDS has to select al nodes down to degree 2 (essentially all nodes) to dominate these off-hanging leaves — a feature left unchanged by edge-mixing.

Figure 6 presents the effects of assortativity on domination stability. We see an unexpected behavior: as assortativity increases, domination stability decreases against random damage, but increases against an attack on high-degree nodes. We can understand this

behavior by considering the effects of assortativity on dominator node degrees. In disassortative networks dominators are mostly high-degree hubs, while in assortative networks dominators have a full range of degrees. Thus, when the network is disassortative and the damage is random, it is less likely to remove high-degree hubs and more likely to remove low degree nodes, the latter rarely being a dominator, leading to increased stability. On the other hand, the result is reversed when high-degree nodes are targeted, in which case we are more likely removing dominators, leading to decreased stability.

Finally, we can conjecture that the outstandingly high domination stability in brain graphs can be attributed to both their high average degree and high assortativity. High average degree results in a highly redundant dominating set (regardless of method) which resists random damage successfully, while high assortativity guarantees that an attack targeted at high degrees leaves the network with plenty of lower-degree dominators.

Partial Flexible-Redundancy Dominating Sets

There are two possible ways to achieve a certain desired cost (dominating set size) with frDS. Either we aim for the lowest r value that provides the desired cost, or we may choose a larger r value, and use only a fraction of the larger dominating set it provides. In the latter case we would select nodes in the same order as the greedy algorithm picked them. In other words, we can either select a full frDS with small r or a partial frDS with the same size but larger r. Figure 7 shows the comparison of these two cases (see Supplementary Figures S9–S14 for analysis over a wide range of network parameters). The contour curves of fixed stability values are monotonically increasing for larger r values, indicating that the cost for a certain stability level increases if we use partial frDS with higher r values. This also means that using full frDS with the smallest possible r value provides the highest possible stability.

In order to find the needed r value for a desired cost we must look at the relationship between r and the size of the resulting dominating set (see Fig. 2(a) inset, and Supplementary Figure S6). The frDS size curve has a complex shape, but it is always monotonically increasing. Therefore, we can use a bisection method for finding the desired r value. Without any assumptions (other than monotonicity) about the size of frDS we must calculate the full frDS for every tested r, each taking $O(E)$ time, leading to $O(E \log N)$ time complexity for the entire procedure.

It is also interesting to note that the cost of stability increases slightly for smaller r values when $r < 1$, in case of a random damage [in Fig. 7(a)]. In this case even the full frDS is providing only a partial dominating set (dominating only a fraction of nodes in the undamaged network). This indicates that r should never be smaller than 1; if a smaller cost is needed than the one provided by frDS with $r = 1$ (which is the MDS by definition), then a partial MDS (given by the greedy MDS algorithm) is a more optimal solution.

Effects of Incorrectly Estimated Damage in fcDS

For practical applications of fcDS, it is necessary to understand how stability is affected, when the network damage is estimated incorrectly. We can check this effect for a degree-ranked attack by using the following sigmoid strength function for a node with degree k:

$$s(k) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{\alpha(k-\kappa(\alpha,f))}}. \tag{5}$$

There are two control parameters for the anticipation. The slope parameter $\alpha \in (-\infty, \infty)$ describes the attack distribution: it expresses whether low degrees ($\alpha < 0$) or high degrees ($\alpha > 0$) are targeted, and how sharp the difference is between targeted and non-targeted node strengths; parameter f is the anticipated damage fraction. The $\kappa(\alpha, f)$ function gives the threshold for the sigmoid, such that the expected number of lost nodes equals the anticipated damage, $\sum_k (1 - s(k))p(k) = f$ (where $p(k)$ is the degree distribution). Note, that $\alpha = \infty$ gives a sharp cutoff selecting all nodes above κ, corresponding to the actual attack; $0 < \alpha \lesssim 5$ corresponds to an uncertain transition point but correct anticipation; $a \approx 0$ corresponds to a random guess; $-5 \lesssim \alpha < 0$ corresponds to an incorrect anticipation (i.e., anticipating attack on low degree nodes, when the attack occurs at high-degree nodes); and $\alpha \ll -5$ is the complete opposite of the actual attack.

Figure 8 shows the landscape of stability as a function of the control parameters. As expected, we obtain the highest stability when the attacked degrees and the size of the attack are correctly estimated. For small damage fractions ($f = 0.1$) we lose stability mostly for overestimating the size of the attack, while for moderate ($f = 0.3$) and large ($f = 0.5$) damages we lose stability for incorrectly anticipating which degrees are targeted.

Discussion

We must clarify and make a distinction between the prescribed domination redundancy and the actual achieved domination redundancy in a network, when using frDS. The former is the one denoted by the r parameter, while the latter (i.e., the actual number of dominators in the closed neighborhood of a node) can be easily calculated for any given dominating set (not just frDS), and its average always exceeds the prescribed value. For example, even an MDS could have an actual average redundancy of 2.5 in certain networks, although most nodes would have only one dominator. However, an frDS with $r = 2.5$ would guarantee not only that the actual redundancy is at least 2.5, but also that no nodes will have less than 2 dominators.

The usage of frDS against degree-ranked or any other targeted attacks seems counter-intuitive, since in frDS, we aim for an overall increased redundancy that is most effective against random damage. However, the greedy algorithm has no preference toward selecting low-degree or high-degree dominators when trying to fulfill domination requirements, and in general, we observe empirically that the selected dominators have a large variability in

degrees. This indicates that dominators of a given node may have significantly different degrees, which helps to keep the node dominated even if high degree nodes are targeted by an attack.

In the calculation of node stability in fcDS we assumed that nodes are deleted independently. In a realistic scenario, an attack may have between-node correlations, especially, in spatial graphs (e.g., clustered attack on a power grid). Taking this into count would add more complexity to the calculations, which we postpone for future work. However, it is important to emphasize that even without correlations, the fcDS algorithm can use arbitrary node strength values, irrespective of node degrees, therefore its applicability goes much beyond our studied scenario of a degree-ranked attack.

Currently, the time complexity of fcDS is $O(d^2 \log N)$ for selecting each dominator node, which makes it prohibitive for very large graphs. In order to speed up the algorithm, the only obstacle we need to overcome is maintaining the sortedness of nodes by their potentials efficiently, which takes $O(\log N)$ steps after each change with comparative sorting. In principle, the potentials could be discretized and assigned to bins (the same optimization we use in frDS), which would lead to $O(E)$ complexity, as long as the bin count remains $O(N)$. However, the effects of such discretization on the dominating set and its stability is unclear, and it would require a thorough analysis to test the method's viability.

We can easily explain that fcDS has a slightly lower stability than frDS at low damage fractions, which we can observe in all graphs, by looking at the effects of incorrect attack anticipation. When the actual damage is very small, we overestimate the damage with our degree-dependent strength formula ($s(i) = 1 - d(i)/N$), because we assign nonzero probabilities to losing nodes with medium to low degrees. In reality, these nodes will not be deleted in a small targeted attack, thus the overestimated damage causes fcDS to lose stability, dropping slightly below the levels of frDS. This also underlines the need to correctly estimate the size as well as the distribution of the expected attack to achieve the most optimal domination stability.

Finally, we can provide a simple guide for selecting one of our two methods for practical applications. If we have no detailed information about a potential attack, or the network is very large, then frDS is a good choice for providing a dominating set with decent stability against any form of damage (mostly against random damage originating from natural sources), with a short computational time. However, if there is a fixed budget for dominators, or detailed (and reliable) information is available about potential attacks, then fcDS can be used to optimize the selected dominating set for the highest possible stability.

Methods

We measure domination stability as an averaged value over an ensemble of networks, using the following procedure. First, a network sample is generated, and its dominating set is calculated by one of the preselected dominating set search algorithms. Then, m nodes are

removed from the network, according to a predetermined node removal strategy, where $m/N = f$ is the desired fraction removed from a network with N nodes. Finally, stability is evaluated using Eq. 1 in the remaining network.

Each node removal strategy is implemented using a sorted list of all nodes in the network; nodes are sorted such that the first m nodes will be removed. For random node removal the list of nodes is shuffled (a random permutation is computed) by the Fisher-Yates algorithm [31]. For degree-ranked node removal the nodes are sorted in decreasing order of degrees (with random tie-breaking).

We generate scale-free network samples using the configuration model [32, 33]. First, a discrete power-law degree distribution is constructed for given network size N, degree exponent γ, and average degree $\langle k \rangle$. The degree sequence is then sampled from the degree distribution, and treated as a set of half-links for each node to be connected. Links are realized by randomly (uniformly) selecting any two unconnected half-links, until no more links can be formed. This may result in multiple links between some nodes, but they are treated only as single links, resulting in a small loss of total links. However, the loss is negligible, since we only focus on networks with $\gamma > 2$.

The average degree is controlled by adjusting the minimum degree cutoff $k_{\min}$ of the degree distribution, while the maximum degree cutoff $k_{\max} = \sqrt{N}$. The correct $k_{\min}$ value that yields the desired average degree for the network is obtained from a precomputed lookup table. We have used the same technique in our previous work [4] where we have shown the high level of accuracy achievable with this method. According to our previous notation in [4], the networks we use here are cCONF networks (abbreviation for configuration model with structural cutoff $k_{\max} = \sqrt{N}$).

Acknowledgments

We thank Tao Jia for valuable discussion. This work was supported in part by grant No. FA9550-12-1-0405 from the U.S. Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR) and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), by the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) Award No. HDTRA1-09-1-0049, by the National Science Foundation (NSF) Grant No. DMR-1246958, by the Army Research Laboratory (ARL) under Cooperative Agreement Number W911NF-09-2-0053, by the Army Research Office (ARO) grant W911NF-12-1-0546, and by the Office of Naval Research (ONR) Grant No. N00014-09-1-0607. The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the official policies either expressed or implied of the Army Research Laboratory or the U.S. Government.

Author Contributions

F.M., N.D., B.K.S. and G.K. designed the research; F.M. and N.D. implemented and performed numerical experiments and simulations; F.M., N.D., B.K.S. and G.K. analyzed data and discussed results; F.M., N.D., B.K.S. and G.K. wrote and reviewed the manuscript.

Additional Information

Competing financial interests: The authors declare no competing financial interests.

References

[1] Haynes, T.W., Hedetniemi, S.T., Slater, P.J. *Fundamentals of Domination in Graphs.* Marcel Dekker, New York (1998).

[2] Echenique, P., Gómez-Gardeñes, J., Moreno, Y., Vázquez, A. Distance-d covering problems in scale-free networks with degree correlations. *Phys. Rev. E* **71**, 035102(R) (2005).

[3] Nacher, J.C., Akutsu, T. Dominating scale-free networks with variable scaling exponent: heterogeneous networks are not difficult to control. *New J. Phys.* **14,** 073005 (2012).

[4] Molnár, F. Jr., Sreenivasan, S., Szymanski, B.K., Korniss, G. Minimum dominating sets in scale-gree network ensembles. *Sci. Rep.* **3,** 1736 (2013).

[5] Kelleher, L., Cozzens, M. Dominating Sets in Social Network Graphs. *Math. Soc. Sciences* **16**, 267–279 (1988).

[6] Wang, F., Du, H., Camacho, E., Xu, K., Lee, W., Shi, Y., Shan, S. On positive influence dominating sets in social networks. *Theo. Comp. Sci.* **412**, 265–269 (2011).

[7] Eubank, S., Anil Kumar, V.S., Marathe, M.V., Srinivasan, A., Wang N. Structural and algorithmic aspects of massive social networks. In *SODA '04 Proc. of the fifteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pp. 718–727 (2004).

[8] Nacher, J.C., Akutsu, T. Analysis on critical nodes in controlling complex networks using dominating sets. *Signal-Image Technology & Internet-Based Systems*, 649-654 (2013).

[9] Nacher, J.C., Akutsu, T. Structural controllability of unidirectional bipartite networks. *Sci. Rep.* **3**, 1647 (2013).

[10] Nadher, J.C., Akutsu, T. Analysis of critical and redundant nodes in controlling directed and undirected complex networks using dominating sets. *J. Complex Networks* Advance Access published July 13, doi:10.1093/comnet/cnu029 (2014).

[11] Jia, T. et al. Emergence of bimodality in controlling complex networks. *Nat. Commun.* **4,** 2002 (2013).

[12] Yang, Y., Wang, J., Motter, A.E. Network Observability Transitions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 258701 (2012).

[13] Wuchty, S. Controllability in protein interaction networks. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, Early Edition, April 28 (2014); http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1311231111 (Accessed June 3, 2014).

[14] Cooper, C., Klasing, R., Zito, M. Lower bounds and algorithms for dominating sets in web graphs. *Internet Math.* **2,** 275–300 (2005).

[15] Potluri, A., Singh, A. Two Hybrid Meta-heuristic Approaches for Minimum Dominating Set Problem. *Lect. Notes Comput. Sc.* Vol. **7077,** 97–104 (2011).

[16] Hedar, A.R., Ismail, R. Hybrid Genetic Algorithm for Minimum Dominating Set Problem. *Lect. Notes Comput. Sc.* Vol. **6019,** 457–467 (2010).

[17] Molnár, F. Jr., Derzsy, N., Czabarka, É., Székely, L., Szymanski, B.K., Korniss, G. Dominating Scale-Free Networks Using Generalized Probabilistic Methods. `arXiv:1406.4851 [physics.soc-ph]`

[18] Albert, R., Jeong, H., Barabási, A.-L. Error and attack tolerance of complex networks. *Nature* **406,** 378-382, 2000.

[19] Duch, J., Arenas, A. Effect of random failures on traffic in complex networks. *Proc. SPIE* **6601,** 66010O (2007).

[20] Gallos, L. K., Cohen, R., Argyrakis, P., Bunde, A., Havlin, S. Stability and topology of scale-free networks under attack and defense strategies. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94,** 188701 (2005).

[21] Holme, P., Kim, B.J. Attack vulnerability of complex networks. *Phys. Rev. E* **65,** 056109 (2002).

[22] Cohen, R., Erez, K., ben-Avraham, D., Havlin, S. Resilience of the Internet to Random Breakdowns. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85,** 4626–4628 (2000).

[23] Cohen, R., Erez, K., ben-Avraham, D., Havlin, S. Breakdown of the Internet under Intentional Attack. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86,** 3682–3685 (2001).

[24] Callaway, D.S., Newman, M.E.J., Strogatz, S.H., Watts, D.J. Network Robustness and Fragility: Percolation on Random Graphs. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85,** 5468–5471 (2000).

[25] Tanizawa, T. Structural robustness and transport efficiency of complex networks with degree correlation. `arXiv:1209.4897 [physics.soc-ph]`

[26] Paul, G., Tanizawa, T., Havlin, S., Stanley, H.E. Optimization of robustness of complex networks. *Eur. Phys. J. B* **38(2),** 187-191 (2004).

[27] Tanizawa, T., Paul, G., Cohen, R., Havlin, S., Stanley, H.E. Optimization of network robustness to waves of targeted and random attacks. *Phys. Rev. E* **71,** 047101 (2005).

[28] Hayashi, Y., Miyazaki, T. Emergent rewirings for cascades on correlated networks. `arXiv:cond-mat/0503615 [cond-mat.dis-nn]`

[29] Asztalos, A., Sreenivasan, S., Szymanski, B.K., Korniss, G. Cascading failures in spatialy-embedded random networks. *PLoS ONE* **9(1),** e84563 (2014).

[30] Alon, N., Spencer, J.H. *The Probabilsitic Method. 2nd ed.* Willey, New York (2000).

[31] Knuth, D. *The Art of Computer Programming 2 (3rd ed.).* Seminumerical Algorithms, Boston: Addison-Wesley, 145-146 (1998).

[32] Molloy, M., Reed, B. A critical point for random graphs with a given degree sequence. *Random Struct. Algor.* **6,** 161–180 (1995).

[33] Britton, T., Deijfen, M., Martin-L of, A. Generating simple random graphs with prescribed degree distribution. *J. Stat. Phys.* **124,** 1377–1397 (2005).

[34] Viger, F., Latapy, M. Efficient and simple generation of random simple connected graphs with prescribed degree sequence. *11th Intl. Comp. and Combin. Conf.*, 440–449 (2005).

[35] Newman, M.E.J. Assortative mixing in networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89,** 208701 (2002).

[36] Newman, M.E.J. Mixing patterns in networks. *Phys. Rev. E* **67,** 026126 (2003).

[37] Spearman, C. The Proof and Measurement of Association between Two Things. *Amer. J. Psychol.* **15,** 72-101 (1904).

[38] Borkowf, C.B. Computing the nonnull asymptotic variance and the asymptotic relative efficiency of Spearman's rank correlation. *Comput. Stat. & Data Anal.* **39,** 271-286 (2002).

[39] Litvak, N., van der Hofstad, R. Uncovering disassortativity in large scale-free networks. *Phys. Rev. E* **87,** 022801 (2013).

[40] Cooper, C., Klasing, R., Zito, M. Lower bounds and algorithms for dominating sets in web graphs. *Internet Math.* **2,** 275–300 (2005).

[41] Raz, R., Safra, S. A sub-constant error-probability low-degree test, and a sub-constant error-probability PCP characterization of NP. *Proc. of the 29th annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 475–484 (1997).

[42] Klasing, R., Laforest, C. Hardness results and approximation algorithms of k-tuple domination in graphs. *Inform. Process. Lett.* **89,** 75-83 (2004).

[43] Stanford Network Analysis Project (SNAP), http://snap.stanford.edu/data, Accessed 12/2013.

[44] Hutcheon, N., Bialek, J.W. Updated and validated power flow model of the main continental European transmission network. *PowerTech, IEEE Grenoble*, 16–20 (2013).

[45] Continental European Transmission Network (2009 winter data), Available: http://www.powerworld.com/bialek Accessed 08/2014.

[46] Open Connectome Project, http://mrbrain.cs.jhu.edu/disa/download Accessed 07/2014.

[47] Roncal, W.G. et al. MIGRAINE: MRI Graph Reliability Analysis and Inference for Connectomics. *GlobalSIP, IEEE*, 313–316 (2013).

Figures & Captions



Figure 1: Stability of various dominating sets against random and degree-ranked node removal. Subfigures (a), (c), and (e) show random node removal, (b), (d), and (f) show degree ranked node removal. Subfigures (a) and (b) show stability in the entire network, while (c) and (d) show stability within the remaining giant component. The inset in (a) shows the corresponding sizes of dominating sets, and insets in (c) and (d) show the size of the corresponding giant component. Subfigures (e) and (f) show a correlation between set size and stability, at $\gamma = 2.5$. All plots show synthetic scale-free networks, $N = 5000$, $\langle k \rangle = 8$, averaged over 200 network samples.



Figure 2: Domination stability in frDS and fcDS as a function of domination redundancy. (a) shows random node removal, (b) shows degree-ranked node removal. The inset shows the sizes of the corresponding dominating sets. The size of fcDS is set to match frDS at any given r value. Synthetic scale-free networks, $N = 5000$, $\langle k \rangle = 8$, $\gamma = 2.5$, $f = 0.3$, averaged over 200 network samples.



Figure 3: Stability of frDS and fcDS as a function of dominating set size (cost) for various network damage fractions. Stabilities of MDS, CDS, and DDS are presented at their corresponding cost values. Subfigure (a) shows random node removal, (b) shows degree-ranked node removal, for synthetic scale-free networks, $N = 5000$, $\langle k \rangle = 8$, $\gamma = 2.5$, averaged over 200 network samples.



Figure 4: Comparison of domination stability at fixed cost levels, as a function of network damage fraction. Stability of frDS and fcDS are plotted at cost values identical to MDS, CDS and DDS. Subfigure (a) shows random node removal, (b) shows degree-ranked node removal, for synthetic scale-free networks, $N = 5000$, $\langle k \rangle = 8$, $\gamma = 2.5$, averaged over 200 network samples.



Figure 5: Stability of frDS, fcDS and other dominating sets in real networks against random and degree-ranked attacks, for various damage fractions: (a,b) Gnutella peer-to-peer network; (c,d) ENTSO-E powergrid; (e,f) Brain (MRI) network. Data is averaged over 20 independent runs of node removal. See Table 1 for network parameters.



Figure 6: Stability of frDS and fcDS in edge-mixed real networks against random and degree-ranked attacks, for various assortativity levels: (a,b) Gnutella peer-to-peer network; (c,d) ENTSO-E powergrid; (e,f) Brain (MRI) network. Network damage fraction $f = 0.3$. For (a-d) data is averaged over 50 independent runs edge mixing and node removal; (e,f) is from a single run. See Table 1 for parameters of the original networks.



Figure 7: Domination stability of partial frDS as a function of domination redundancy and dominating set size. The plotted area is bounded by the size of the full frDS at any given r. Subfigure (a) shows random node removal, (b) shows degree-ranked node removal, for synthetic scale-free networks, $N = 5000$, $\langle k \rangle = 8$, $\gamma = 2.5$, $f = 0.3$, averaged over 50 network samples.



Figure 8: Stability of fcDS against degree-ranked node removal as a function of the damage anticipation accuracy: (a) synthetic scale-free network with $N = 5000$, $\langle k \rangle = 8$, $\gamma = 2.5$; (b) Gnutella peer-to-peer network; (c) ENTSO-E powergrid. The actual damage fraction is indicated above the plots and marked by red dashed lines; the actual degree distribution of the damage corresponds to $\alpha \geq 4$ values.

Name	Source	N	$k_{\min}$	$k_{\max}$	$\langle k \rangle$	Spearman's ρ
Gnutella08	[43]	6299	1	97	6.60	0.03
powergrid	[44, 45]	1494	1	13	2.89	-0.18
KKI-21-KKI2009-19	[46, 47]	712098	1	6505	138.2	0.62

Table 1: Parameters of real networks used in our analysis. The data refers exclusively to the giant component.

Building Damage-Resilient Dominating Sets in Complex Networks against Random and Targeted Attacks

Supplementary Information

F. Molnár Jr.[1,2,1], N. Derzsy[1,2], B. K. Szymanski[2,3], G. Korniss[1,2]

[1] Department of Physics, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 110 8^{th} Street, Troy, NY, 12180-3590 USA
[2] Social Cognitive Networks Academic Research Center, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 110 8^{th} Street, Troy, NY, 12180-3590 USA
[3] Department of Computer Science, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 110 8^{th} Street, Troy, NY, 12180-3590 USA

Supplementary Note 1

Algorithm for Finding a Flexible-Redundancy Dominating Set (frDS)

The algorithm for finding a flexible-redundancy dominating set (frDS) is based on greedy search. At each step we add one node to the dominating set, that helps the maximum number of nodes to advance toward their required domination goals. There are several variables that we must define and track for each node.

First, we define the domination requirement $r(i)$ as the number of required dominators for node i among its closed neighbors. This value is calculated and assigned randomly for each node before the search begins. The requirement is either $\lfloor r \rfloor$ or $\lceil r \rceil$ (where r is the global requirement for the entire network), the probability for the latter is exactly the fractional part of r (that is, $r - \lfloor r \rfloor$). Note, that $r(i)$ can be zero if $r < 1$, and it is also possible that $r > d(i) + 1$ (where $d(i)$ is the degree of node i), in which case all nodes in the closed neighborhood are required to be in the dominating set.

Second, we define $score(i)$ as the current number of dominators of node i at any given step. Initially, $score(i) = 0$ for every node, and it increases by one in the closed neighborhood of the selected node.

Finally, we track the dominating $potential(i)$ of node i, which counts how many nodes in the closed neighborhood of i have not yet reached their domination requirement. Specifically, $potential(i) = \sum_{j \in N^+(i)} I[score(j) < r(j)]$, where $N^+(i)$ is the closed neighborhood of i and $I[x]$ is an indicator function that returns 1 if x is true and 0 else. In other words, the potential is the number of nodes in the closed neighborhood that can be advanced toward their goal by selecting i as the next dominator. The greedy search is based on this quantity: at every step we select a node with maximum potential (with random tie-breaking among the candidates).

The key to implementing the algorithm with optimal time complexity is the use of an efficient data structure for maintaining a list of nodes sorted by their potentials. Note that the potential is an integer value between 0 and $N + 1$, therefore we can use bucket-sort for initial sorting. We assign one bucket for each possible potential value, and we implement each bucket by a hashed set. This way we can add or remove a node from any bucket in $O(1)$ step, therefore we can perform the initial sorting in $O(N)$ and maintain sortedness in $O(1)$ step after any single change in a node's potential.

The time complexity of the algorithm can be found by analyzing the changes in scores and potentials of nodes. The initial calculation of potentials requires a loop over all nodes' all neighbors. Assuming we can enumerate the neighbors of node i in $d(i)$ steps, this calculation takes $\sum_{i \in V(G)} 1 + d(i) = 2E + N = O(E)$ steps. Then in the main loop one node

[1] E-mail: molnaf@rpi.edu

is selected at every step, which increases the score of the selected node and its neighbors by one. In principle, the scores could increase until all nodes are selected (e.g., when $r > N$), therefore again all nodes' all neighbors are processed, taking $O(E)$ steps. However, during this procedure, there are additional steps for updating the node potentials. Some (usually all) nodes will reach their predefined requirement at one point or another, after which the dominating potentials change. We count these changes as follows. Initially, all nodes can increase all their neighbors' score toward their requirement (including the nodes themselves), therefore the initial sum of potentials is $\sum_{i \in V(G)} 1 + d(i) = 2E + N$, or less, if some nodes have zero requirement. The potential of a node can either be reduced by one if a neighbor reaches its requirement (and thus that neighbor can no longer be advanced to its goal by the current node), or it becomes zero by definition if the node is actually selected. At most, there are $2E + N = O(E)$ changes (reductions) of potentials, each computed in $O(1)$ time (maintaining sortedness of nodes after each change), therefore during the procedure there are at most $O(E)$ additional steps for updating node potentials. This means the entire algorithm runs in $O(E)$ steps. Note that in sparse networks, $O(E) = O(N)$.

Algorithm S1 Find an frDS

```
procedure FRDS(G: graph, r: domination redundancy)
    finished ← 0
    for all i ∈ V(G) do                          ▷ initialization of score, r, and potential
        score(i) ← 0
        potential(i) ← 0
        if Random(0,1) < r − ⌊r⌋ then
            r(i) ← ⌈r⌉
        else
            r(i) ← ⌊r⌋
        end if
        if score(i) ≥ r(i) then
            finished ← finished + 1
        end if
    end for
    for all i ∈ V(G) do                          ▷ initial calculation of potentials
        for all j : (i, j) ∈ E(G) do
            if score(j) < r(j) then
                potential(i) ← potential(i) + 1
            end if
        end for
        if score(i) < goal(i) then
            potential(i) ← potential(i) + 1
        end if
    end for
    while finished < |V(G)| ∧ max(potential) > 0 do                ▷ main loop
        k := random node with maximum potential                    ▷ greedy step
        Add k to Dominating Set                                    ▷ construct the output
        score(k) ← score(k) + 1                                    ▷ count self-domination
        potential(k) ← 0                                           ▷ remove k from further consideration
        change ← score(k) = r(k)                                   ▷ requirement of k reached in this iteration?
        if change then
            finished ← finished + 1
        end if
        for all j : (j, k) ∈ E(G) do                               ▷ update neighbors of k
            if change then                                         ▷ neighbors cannot increase score(k) any more
                potential(j) ← max(0, potential(j) − 1)
            end if
            score(j) ← score(j) + 1                                ▷ k adds domination score to all its neighbors
            if score(j) = r(j) then                                ▷ requirement reached for the neighbor?
                finished ← finished + 1
                potential(j) ← max(0, potential(j) − 1)
                for all x : (x, j) ∈ E(G) do                       ▷ update potentials of second neighbors
                    if x ≠ k then                                  ▷ skip when second neighbor is k
                        potential(x) ← max(0, potential(x) − 1)
                    end if
                end for
            end if
        end for
    end while
end procedure
```

Supplementary Note 2
Algorithm for Finding a Flexible-Cost Dominating Set (fcDS)

The fcDS algorithm is also a form of greedy search, since it builds the dominating set by selecting one node at a time with maximum potential, similarly to the frDS algorithm. However, in this method the potential is calculated from the changes in probability of losing all dominators for the nodes in the neighborhood of the given node.

First, we define $strength(i)$ for each node i as an input ($0 < strength(i) < 1$), which defines the probability of not losing node i after the anticipated damage:

$$strength(i) := \Pr(i \text{ is not lost}). \tag{S1}$$

We also keep a record of $instability(i)$ for each node i, which is defined as the probability of losing all dominators after the damage has occured:

$$instability(i) = \prod_{j \in \mathrm{DS} \cap N^+(i)} 1 - strength(j). \tag{S2}$$

Initially, $instability(i) = 1.0$ for all i. The $potential(i)$ of node i, which is used in the greedy node selection, is calculated as the sum of the changes in instabilities over the closed neighborhood of node i, if i was selected:

$$\begin{aligned} potential(i) &= -\sum_{j \in N^+(i)} instability(j) \Pr(i \text{ is lost}) - instability(j) \\ &= -\sum_{j \in N^+(i)} instability(j) \left[\Pr(i \text{ is lost}) - 1\right] \\ &= \sum_{j \in N^+(i)} instability(j) strength(i). \end{aligned} \tag{S3}$$

Note, that the negative sign is manually inserted to make the potential a positive value, for practical reasons. Without it, the change in instabilities would be negative, because by each node selection the stability always increases.

With the definition above, we select a node with maximum potential at each greedy step. After the node has been selected and added to the dominating set, the instabilities in the closed neighborhood, and the potentials for all nodes in the second neighborhood of the selected node must be recalculated, and the nodes must be sorted again based on the new potentials. Since the potentials are non-integer values (and cannot be mapped to integers) we can only use comparative sorting, where it takes $O(\log N)$ steps to find the new place for each node in the list. With a simple approximation for sparse networks, a node in a network with average degree d will have $O(d^2)$ nodes in its second neighborhood, therefore the selection of each dominator involves $O(d^2 \log N)$ steps.

Algorithm S2 Find an fcDS

procedure FCDS(G: graph, *strength*: array, c: number of nodes to select)
  for all $i \in V(G)$ **do** ▷ initialization of *instability* and *potential*
    $instability(i) \leftarrow 1.0$
    $potential(i) \leftarrow (degree(i) + 1)(1 - strength(i))$
  end for
  for $a \leftarrow 1$ ... c **do** ▷ a simply counts the output
    $k \leftarrow$ random node with maximum potential ▷ greedy selection
    Add k to Dominating Set ▷ construct the output
    $S \leftarrow \varnothing$ ▷ set of nodes whose potential must be updated
    $instability(k) \leftarrow instability(k)(1 - strength(k))$ ▷ update self instability
    for all $j : (k, j) \in E(G)$ **do**
      $instability(j) \leftarrow instability(j)(1 - strength(k)$ ▷ update instability of neighbors
      $S \leftarrow S \cup \{j\}$ ▷ request potential update for j
      for all $i : (j, i) \in E(G)$ **do**
        $S \leftarrow S \cup \{i\}$ ▷ request potential update for second neighbors
      end for
    end for
    for all $i \in S$ **do** ▷ update potentials
      $potential(i) \leftarrow 0$
      if $i \notin$ Dominating Set **then**
        for all $j : (i, j) \in E(G)$ **do**
          $potential(i) \leftarrow potential(i) + instability(j)strength(i)$
        end for
        $potential(i) \leftarrow potential(i) + instability(i)strength(i)$
      end if
    end for
  end for
end procedure

Supplementary Note 3
Measuring and Controlling Assortativity

Assortativity of a network, defined loosely, is the tendency that nodes of similar degrees are connected to each other. We measure assortativity of a network using Spearman's ρ [1], which has been shown recently [2] to be a much more accurate measure of assortativity than Newman's assortativity coefficient [3, 4]. Spearman's ρ values have a range of $(-1, 1)$, ranging from completely disassortative to completely assortative. Note, that a network with $\rho = 0$ is called an uncorrelated network.

In our recent work [5] we have proposed a method to control the assortativity of a network using a Markov-chain of double-edge swaps [6], guided by biased edge-swap acceptance probabilities. These swaps preserve the degree sequence of a network, but change its assortativity. We provide here an overview of this method again for the reader's convenience.

In our method, we look for randomly (uniformly) selected pairs of edges that have four distinct nodes and no common incident edges. These edge pairs allow for a double-edge swap. However, instead of accepting all swaps, we only accept them with the following probability:

$$\Pr(\text{accept}) = \begin{cases} p & \text{if } p > 0 \text{ and the swap makes the network more assortative} \\ -p & \text{if } p < 0 \text{ and the swap makes the network more dissortative} \\ 1 - |p| & \text{else,} \end{cases} \tag{S4}$$

where $-1 < p < 1$ is a parameter that controls the acceptance ratio of assortative and dissortative swaps. A swap is classified as assortative or dissortative if it increases or decreases the assortativity coefficient [3, 4] of the network, which can be evaluated very quickly.

Using our guided edge-mixing, we can reach a wide range of ρ values for any given network; however, determining the correct p value for a desired ρ is nontrivial. Due to the random nature of the mixing procedure, the resulting value of ρ is a random variable. The mean of ρ monotonically increases as p increases, allowing us to use a randomized bisection search to find the needed p for a desired ρ.



Supplementary Figure S1: Stability of dominating sets vs. power-law degree exponent γ and Spearman's ρ assortativity measure. (a) and (c) present random node removal, (b) and (d) show degree-ranked node removal. The insets illustrate the sizes of the corresponding dominating sets. In (a) and (b): $\rho = 0.0$; in (c) and (d): $\gamma = 2.5$. Common parameters: $N = 5000$, $\langle k \rangle = 8$, $f = 0.3$. Results are averaged over 200 network samples.



Supplementary Figure S2: Comparison of size and stability of dominating sets vs. power-law degree exponent, at various fractions of random node removal. Synthetic networks, $N = 5000$, $\langle k \rangle = 8$, $\rho = 0.0$. Results are averaged over 200 network samples.



Supplementary Figure S3: Comparison of size and stability of dominating sets vs. power-law degree exponent at various fractions of degree ranked node removal. Synthetic networks, $N = 5000$, $\langle k \rangle = 8$, $\rho = 0.0$. Results are averaged over 200 network samples.



Supplementary Figure S4: Comparison of size and stability dominating sets vs. assortativity at various fractions of random node removal. Synthetic networks, $N = 5000$, $\langle k \rangle = 8$, $\gamma = 2.5$. Results are averaged over 200 network samples.



Supplementary Figure S5: Comparison of size and stability dominating sets vs. assortativity at various fractions of degree-ranked node removal. Synthetic networks, $N = 5000$, $\langle k \rangle = 8$, $\gamma = 2.5$. Results are averaged over 200 network samples.



Supplementary Figure S6: Size of frDS as a function of domination redundancy, at various power-law degree exponents and Spearman's ρ values, in synthetic networks with $N = 5000$. The sizes of MDS, CDS, and DDS are shown for comparison.



Supplementary Figure S7: Stability of frDS and fcDS against random damage, as a function of dominating set size (cost), at various power-law degree exponents and Spearman's ρ values, in synthetic networks with $N = 5000$. The stabilities of MDS, CDS, and DDS are shown for comparison at their corresponding set sizes. Black legend symbols refer to the shape only, colors refer to damage fractions.



Supplementary Figure S8: Stability of frDS and fcDS against targeted attack, as a function of dominating set size (cost), at various power-law degree exponents and Spearman's ρ values, in synthetic networks with $N = 5000$. The stabilities of MDS, CDS, and DDS are shown for comparison at their corresponding set sizes. Black legend symbols refer to the shape only, colors refer to damage fractions.



Supplementary Figure S9: Stability of partial frDS against random damage, as a function of redundancy level and dominating set size, at various power-law degree exponents and Spearman's ρ values. Synthetic networks, $N = 5000$, damage fraction $f = 0.1$.



Supplementary Figure S10: Stability of partial frDS against random damage, as a function of redundancy level and dominating set size, at various power-law degree exponents and Spearman's ρ values. Synthetic networks, $N = 5000$, damage fraction $f = 0.3$.



Supplementary Figure S11: Stability of partial frDS against random damage, as a function of redundancy level and dominating set size, at various power-law degree exponents and Spearman's ρ values. Synthetic networks, $N = 5000$, damage fraction $f = 0.5$.



Supplementary Figure S12: Stability of partial frDS against targeted attack, as a function of redundancy level and dominating set size, at various power-law degree exponents and Spearman's ρ values. Synthetic networks, $N = 5000$, damage fraction $f = 0.1$.



Supplementary Figure S13: Stability of partial frDS against targeted attack, as a function of redundancy level and dominating set size, at various power-law degree exponents and Spearman's ρ values. Synthetic networks, $N = 5000$, damage fraction $f = 0.3$.



Supplementary Figure S14: Stability of partial frDS against targeted attack, as a function of redundancy level and dominating set size, at various power-law degree exponents and Spearman's ρ values. Synthetic networks, $N = 5000$, damage fraction $f = 0.5$.



Supplementary Figure S15: Degree distribution of Gnutella08 network [7] on linear scale.



Supplementary Figure S16: Degree distribution of Gnutella08 network [7] on double-logarithmic scale.



Supplementary Figure S17: Degree distribution of Gnutella08 network [7] on log-linear scale.



Supplementary Figure S18: Degree distribution of ENTSO-E powergrid [8, 9] on linear scale.



Supplementary Figure S19: Degree distribution of ENTSO-E powergrid [8, 9] on double-logarithmic scale.



Supplementary Figure S20: Degree distribution of ENTSO-E powergrid [8, 9] on log-linear scale.



Supplementary Figure S21: Average degree in brain graphs. See Supplementary Table S2 for sample numbers.



Supplementary Figure S22: Assortativity of brain graphs. See Supplementary Table S2 for sample numbers.



Supplementary Figure S23: Degree distributions of 12 randomly picked brain graphs on linear scale.



Supplementary Figure S24: Degree distributions of 12 randomly picked brain graphs on double-logarithmic scale.



Supplementary Figure S25: Degree distributions of 12 randomly picked brain graphs on log-linear scale.



Supplementary Figure S26: Comparison of dominating set sizes in brain graphs. See Supplementary Table S2 for sample numbers.

sample#	graph	sample#	graph
1	KKI-21_KKI2009-01_big_graph_w_inv	51	MRN114_M87114047_big_graph_w_inv
2	KKI-21_KKI2009-02_big_graph_w_inv	52	MRN114_M87114064_big_graph_w_inv
3	KKI-21_KKI2009-03_big_graph_w_inv	53	MRN114_M87115498_big_graph_w_inv
4	KKI-21_KKI2009-04_big_graph_w_inv	54	MRN114_M87115517_big_graph_w_inv
5	KKI-21_KKI2009-05_big_graph_w_inv	55	MRN114_M87117119_big_graph_w_inv
6	KKI-21_KKI2009-06_big_graph_w_inv	56	MRN114_M87117167_big_graph_w_inv
7	KKI-21_KKI2009-07_big_graph_w_inv	57	MRN114_M87120962_big_graph_w_inv
8	KKI-21_KKI2009-08_big_graph_w_inv	58	MRN114_M87121943_big_graph_w_inv
9	KKI-21_KKI2009-09_big_graph_w_inv	59	MRN114_M87121956_big_graph_w_inv
10	KKI-21_KKI2009-10_big_graph_w_inv	60	MRN114_M87122092_big_graph_w_inv
11	KKI-21_KKI2009-11_big_graph_w_inv	61	MRN114_M87123042_big_graph_w_inv
12	KKI-21_KKI2009-12_big_graph_w_inv	62	MRN114_M87123449_big_graph_w_inv
13	KKI-21_KKI2009-13_big_graph_w_inv	63	MRN114_M87123913_big_graph_w_inv
14	KKI-21_KKI2009-14_big_graph_w_inv	64	MRN114_M87124633_big_graph_w_inv
15	KKI-21_KKI2009-15_big_graph_w_inv	65	MRN114_M87124781_big_graph_w_inv
16	KKI-21_KKI2009-16_big_graph_w_inv	66	MRN114_M87124827_big_graph_w_inv
17	KKI-21_KKI2009-17_big_graph_w_inv	67	MRN114_M87125134_big_graph_w_inv
18	KKI-21_KKI2009-18_big_graph_w_inv	68	MRN114_M87128444_big_graph_w_inv
19	KKI-21_KKI2009-19_big_graph_w_inv	69	MRN114_M87129719_big_graph_w_inv
20	KKI-21_KKI2009-20_big_graph_w_inv	70	MRN114_M87129789_big_graph_w_inv
21	KKI-21_KKI2009-21_big_graph_w_inv	71	MRN114_M87131806_big_graph_w_inv
22	KKI-21_KKI2009-22_big_graph_w_inv	72	MRN114_M87134068_big_graph_w_inv
23	KKI-21_KKI2009-23_big_graph_w_inv	73	MRN114_M87135647_big_graph_w_inv
24	KKI-21_KKI2009-24_big_graph_w_inv	74	MRN114_M87136332_big_graph_w_inv
25	KKI-21_KKI2009-25_big_graph_w_inv	75	MRN114_M87136832_big_graph_w_inv
26	KKI-21_KKI2009-26_big_graph_w_inv	76	MRN114_M87139021_big_graph_w_inv
27	KKI-21_KKI2009-27_big_graph_w_inv	77	MRN114_M87139257_big_graph_w_inv
28	KKI-21_KKI2009-28_big_graph_w_inv	78	MRN114_M87141220_big_graph_w_inv
29	KKI-21_KKI2009-29_big_graph_w_inv	79	MRN114_M87141664_big_graph_w_inv
30	KKI-21_KKI2009-30_big_graph_w_inv	80	MRN114_M87141793_big_graph_w_inv
31	KKI-21_KKI2009-31_big_graph_w_inv	81	MRN114_M87141858_big_graph_w_inv
32	KKI-21_KKI2009-32_big_graph_w_inv	82	MRN114_M87141906_big_graph_w_inv
33	KKI-21_KKI2009-33_big_graph_w_inv	83	MRN114_M87141949_big_graph_w_inv
34	KKI-21_KKI2009-34_big_graph_w_inv	84	MRN114_M87142764_big_graph_w_inv
35	KKI-21_KKI2009-35_big_graph_w_inv	85	MRN114_M87143273_big_graph_w_inv
36	KKI-21_KKI2009-36_big_graph_w_inv	86	MRN114_M87144889_big_graph_w_inv
37	KKI-21_KKI2009-37_big_graph_w_inv	87	MRN114_M87144896_big_graph_w_inv
38	KKI-21_KKI2009-38_big_graph_w_inv	88	MRN114_M87145479_big_graph_w_inv
39	KKI-21_KKI2009-39_big_graph_w_inv	89	MRN114_M87145575_big_graph_w_inv
40	KKI-21_KKI2009-40_big_graph_w_inv	90	MRN114_M87146520_big_graph_w_inv
41	KKI-21_KKI2009-41_big_graph_w_inv	91	MRN114_M87146993_big_graph_w_inv
42	KKI-21_KKI2009-42_big_graph_w_inv	92	MRN114_M87147006_big_graph_w_inv
43	MRN114_M87102217_big_graph_w_inv	93	MRN114_M87148745_big_graph_w_inv
44	MRN114_M87102806_big_graph_w_inv	94	MRN114_M87149014_big_graph_w_inv
45	MRN114_M87103074_big_graph_w_inv	95	MRN114_M87149025_big_graph_w_inv
46	MRN114_M87105476_big_graph_w_inv	96	MRN114_M87150194_big_graph_w_inv
47	MRN114_M87107085_big_graph_w_inv	97	MRN114_M87150415_big_graph_w_inv
48	MRN114_M87108094_big_graph_w_inv	98	MRN114_M87150639_big_graph_w_inv
49	MRN114_M87111487_big_graph_w_inv	99	MRN114_M87151117_big_graph_w_inv
50	MRN114_M87111924_big_graph_w_inv	100	MRN114_M87151146_big_graph_w_inv

sample#	graph	sample#	graph
101	MRN114_M87151453_big_graph_w_inv	151	MRN114_M87192995_big_graph_w_inv
102	MRN114_M87152844_big_graph_w_inv	152	MRN114_M87193409_big_graph_w_inv
103	MRN114_M87153569_big_graph_w_inv	153	MRN114_M87196363_big_graph_w_inv
104	MRN114_M87154559_big_graph_w_inv	154	MRN114_M87196591_big_graph_w_inv
105	MRN114_M87155496_big_graph_w_inv	155	MRN114_M87199297_big_graph_w_inv
106	MRN114_M87155949_big_graph_w_inv	156	MRN114_M87199728_big_graph_w_inv
107	MRN114_M87156106_big_graph_w_inv	157	NKI-TRT_0021001_1_big_graph_w_inv
108	MRN114_M87157827_big_graph_w_inv	158	NKI-TRT_0021001_2_big_graph_w_inv
109	MRN114_M87158338_big_graph_w_inv	159	NKI-TRT_0021002_1_big_graph_w_inv
110	MRN114_M87158534_big_graph_w_inv	160	NKI-TRT_0021002_2_big_graph_w_inv
111	MRN114_M87159410_big_graph_w_inv	161	NKI-TRT_0021006_1_big_graph_w_inv
112	MRN114_M87159580_big_graph_w_inv	162	NKI-TRT_0021006_2_big_graph_w_inv
113	MRN114_M87160332_big_graph_w_inv	163	NKI-TRT_0021018_1_big_graph_w_inv
114	MRN114_M87160375_big_graph_w_inv	164	NKI-TRT_0021018_2_big_graph_w_inv
115	MRN114_M87161235_big_graph_w_inv	165	NKI-TRT_0021024_1_big_graph_w_inv
116	MRN114_M87161902_big_graph_w_inv	166	NKI-TRT_0021024_2_big_graph_w_inv
117	MRN114_M87162915_big_graph_w_inv	167	NKI-TRT_1427581_2_big_graph_w_inv
118	MRN114_M87164412_big_graph_w_inv	168	NKI-TRT_1793622_1_big_graph_w_inv
119	MRN114_M87164886_big_graph_w_inv	169	NKI-TRT_1793622_2_big_graph_w_inv
120	MRN114_M87165017_big_graph_w_inv	170	NKI-TRT_1961098_1_big_graph_w_inv
121	MRN114_M87165441_big_graph_w_inv	171	NKI-TRT_1961098_2_big_graph_w_inv
122	MRN114_M87166115_big_graph_w_inv	172	NKI-TRT_2475376_1_big_graph_w_inv
123	MRN114_M87168759_big_graph_w_inv	173	NKI-TRT_2475376_2_big_graph_w_inv
124	MRN114_M87174803_big_graph_w_inv	174	NKI-TRT_2799329_1_big_graph_w_inv
125	MRN114_M87176019_big_graph_w_inv	175	NKI-TRT_2799329_2_big_graph_w_inv
126	MRN114_M87176708_big_graph_w_inv	176	NKI-TRT_2842950_1_big_graph_w_inv
127	MRN114_M87178630_big_graph_w_inv	177	NKI-TRT_2842950_2_big_graph_w_inv
128	MRN114_M87179511_big_graph_w_inv	178	NKI-TRT_3201815_1_big_graph_w_inv
129	MRN114_M87179597_big_graph_w_inv	179	NKI-TRT_3201815_2_big_graph_w_inv
130	MRN114_M87179713_big_graph_w_inv	180	NKI-TRT_3313349_1_big_graph_w_inv
131	MRN114_M87181205_big_graph_w_inv	181	NKI-TRT_3313349_2_big_graph_w_inv
132	MRN114_M87181216_big_graph_w_inv	182	NKI-TRT_3315657_1_big_graph_w_inv
133	MRN114_M87182922_big_graph_w_inv	183	NKI-TRT_3315657_2_big_graph_w_inv
134	MRN114_M87183189_big_graph_w_inv	184	NKI-TRT_3795193_1_big_graph_w_inv
135	MRN114_M87183485_big_graph_w_inv	185	NKI-TRT_3795193_2_big_graph_w_inv
136	MRN114_M87184910_big_graph_w_inv	186	NKI-TRT_3808535_1_big_graph_w_inv
137	MRN114_M87185000_big_graph_w_inv	187	NKI-TRT_3808535_2_big_graph_w_inv
138	MRN114_M87186642_big_graph_w_inv	188	NKI-TRT_3893245_2_big_graph_w_inv
139	MRN114_M87187090_big_graph_w_inv	189	NKI-TRT_4176156_1_big_graph_w_inv
140	MRN114_M87187750_big_graph_w_inv	190	NKI-TRT_4176156_2_big_graph_w_inv
141	MRN114_M87187984_big_graph_w_inv	191	NKI-TRT_4288245_1_big_graph_w_inv
142	MRN114_M87188000_big_graph_w_inv	192	NKI-TRT_4288245_2_big_graph_w_inv
143	MRN114_M87188762_big_graph_w_inv	193	NKI-TRT_6471972_1_big_graph_w_inv
144	MRN114_M87190609_big_graph_w_inv	194	NKI-TRT_7055197_1_big_graph_w_inv
145	MRN114_M87190745_big_graph_w_inv	195	NKI-TRT_7055197_2_big_graph_w_inv
146	MRN114_M87191087_big_graph_w_inv	196	NKI-TRT_8574662_1_big_graph_w_inv
147	MRN114_M87191258_big_graph_w_inv	197	NKI-TRT_8735778_1_big_graph_w_inv
148	MRN114_M87192333_big_graph_w_inv	198	NKI-TRT_8735778_2_big_graph_w_inv
149	MRN114_M87192557_big_graph_w_inv	199	NKI-TRT_9630905_1_big_graph_w_inv
150	MRN114_M87192637_big_graph_w_inv	200	NKI-TRT_9630905_2_big_graph_w_inv

Supplementary Table S2: Sample numbers of brain graphs that we use to identify them in our figures. Graph data is available with identical file names at [10].



Supplementary Figure S27: Dominating set sizes vs. assortativity in **Gnutella08** graph [7], achieved by random (biased) mixing of exges by double-edge swaps. The vertical dashed line indicates the assortativity of the original graph.



Supplementary Figure S28: Dominating set sizes vs. assortativity in **powergrid** graph [8, 9], achieved by random (biased) mixing of exges by double-edge swaps. The vertical dashed line indicates the assortativity of the original graph.



Supplementary Figure S29: Dominating set sizes vs. assortativity in brain graph **KKI-21_KKI2009-19** [10, 11], achieved by random (biased) mixing of edges by double-edge swaps. The vertical dashed line indicates the assortativity of the original graph. Note that frDS curves with $r = 2$ and $r = 3$ overlap.

Supplementary References

[1] Spearman, C. The Proof and Measurement of Association between Two Things. The American Journal of Psychology **15**, 72-101 (1904).

[2] Litvak, N. and van der Hofstad, R. Uncovering disassortativity in large scale-free networks. Phys. Rev. E **87**, 022801 (2013).

[3] Newman, M. Mixing patterns in networks. Phys. Rev. E **67**, 026126 (2003).

[4] Newman, M. Assortative mixing in networks. Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 208701 (2002).

[5] Molnár, F. Jr., Derzsy, N., Czabarka, É., Székely, L., Szymanski, B. K., Korniss, G. Dominating Scale-Free Networks Using Generalized Probabilistic Methods. `arXiv:1406.4851 [physics.soc-ph]`

[6] Viger, F., Latapy, M. Efficient and simple generation of random simple connected graphs with prescribed degree sequence. In Proc. The 11th Intl. Comp. and Combin. Conf. pp. 440–449 (2005).

[7] Stanford Network Analysis Project (SNAP), http://snap.stanford.edu/data, Accessed 12/2013.

[8] Hutcheon, N., Bialek, J.W. Updated and validated power flow model of the main continental European transmission network. *PowerTech, IEEE Grenoble*, 16–20 (2013).

[9] Continental European Transmission Network (2009 winter data), Available: http://www.powerworld.com/bialek Accessed 08/2014.

[10] Open Connectome Project, http://mrbrain.cs.jhu.edu/disa/download Accessed 07/2014.

[11] Roncal, W.G. et al. MIGRAINE: MRI Graph Reliability Analysis and Inference for Connectomics. *GlobalSIP, IEEE*, 313–316 (2013).